

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 19, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beeler. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, "modifying an attribute of one of the first plurality of data sets and setting a checksum associated with one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined value; accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a checksum set to the predetermined value and formatting at least one attribute associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined format type." Embodiments of the invention detect when an attribute is modified and identify that data element by setting a checksum to a predetermined value such as zero (see paragraph [0024]). The data sets having the checksum of zero are then converted to predetermined format types (paragraph [0025]). Beeler fails to teach these features.

Beeler teaches a fast-mirroring process between a source server and a target server. The fast-mirroring process breaks files into blocks and computes a checksum for each block. The checksums are used to determine if the files on the source server match the target server (see Figures 26 and 27, column 15, line 46 – column 16, line 7). There is no teaching in Beeler of "modifying an attribute of one of the first plurality of data sets and setting a checksum associated with one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined value; accessing one of the first plurality of data sets having a checksum set to the predetermined value and formatting at least attribute associated with the one of the first plurality of data sets to a predetermined format type" as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Beeler. Claims 2-4 and 6 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Beeler for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Independent claim 7, as amended, recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and is patentable over Beeler for at least the reasons advanced with

reference to claim 1. Claims 8-10 and 12 depend from claim 7 and are considered patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Becler in view of Ellard. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Ellard was relied upon for disclosing converting data from a first format to a second format, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Becler discussed above with reference to claim 1. Ellard only teaches a data exchange that converts two types of data. Ellard is not directed to synchronizing first and second servers and does not teach use of checksums as discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Becler in view of Ellard for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 1. Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and is patentable over Becler in view of Ellard for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 7.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: June 14, 2007

030366 (BLI-0119)